

**DRAFT – NOT TO BE ENTERED ON THE RECORD**

The Examiner's statement is clearly wrong and appears to miss Applicant's main point. The point is that the disclosure in Lee from col. 9, line 62 through col. 10, line 30 has nothing to do with detecting endpoints of an entire multi-syllabic utterance – it relates to the process of speech recognition (see col. 9, lines 62-65, and Applicant's remarks on p. 13 of the last Amendment), which happens after detecting the endpoints of the utterance. The text at col. 10, lines 1-5 does discuss locating the ending points of individual syllables only, not endpoints of an entire utterance that includes multiple syllables. The only place in Lee where any disclosure of detecting the endpoints of an entire multi-syllabic utterance (which happens before recognition) is found is at col. 6, lines 13-36, and there is no disclosure there of basing the endpoint detection on the duration of any syllable.

Second, the Examiner responds to Applicant's arguments that the Office's rationale for combining the references lacks merit (last Amendment, p. 14), by stating that the motivation would be, "In this case, detect the endpoint of the utterance, which helps enhancement of recognition process (see col. 3, lines 15-20)." Final Office Action, p. 9. The Examiner merely restates the original, unsupportable rationale for combining the references, rather than rebutting Applicant's argument. As previously stated, Peckham already discloses an endpoint detection technique, and there is no basis to conclude that the recognition technique in Peckham would be improved by substituting the endpointing technique disclosed in Lee, or vice versa. Hence, there would be no motivation for one skilled in the art to attempt to combine the teachings of these references.

**DRAFT – NOT TO BE ENTERED ON THE RECORD**Independent Claim 9

In paragraph 10 of the Final Office Action (p. 9), the Examiner refers to Applicant's argument on p. 15 of the last Amendment, by stating:

"The Examiner note that the above limitation is teaches at col. 9, line 62 to col. 10, lines 30. Here endpoint is detected using tone model as well as individual syllable."

The Examiner's response is clearly wrong. As noted above, the section of text in Lee cited by the Examiner relates to recognition, not to detecting the endpoints of an entire multi-syllabic utterance. Furthermore, even though this section of text briefly discusses locating the endpoint of an individual syllable, the tone models are not used for that purpose. In Lee, the ending points of an individual syllable are first identified, and then the base syllable model and the tone model are used to recognize the syllable. See col. 10, lines 1-17. The tone models are not used to detect the endpoints of any syllable or utterance. Consequently, Lee does not disclose or suggest determining a probability based on a result of comparing the intonation of the utterance with an intonation model, and then identifying an endpoint of the utterance based on that probability.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, the Examiner's responses to Applicant's arguments are wrong. Applicant, therefore, maintains the arguments in the Amendment field on

**DRAFT – NOT TO BE ENTERED ON THE RECORD**

February 20, 2004. For the reasons stated therein and above, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly requested.